UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/799,861	03/12/2004	Vijay Deshmukh	5693P047	1723

48102 7590 04/04/2007
NETWORK APPLIANCE/BLAKELY
12400 WILSHIRE BLVD
SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030

EXAMINER	
VAUTROT, DENNIS L	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2167	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/04/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/799,861	DESHMUKH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dennis L. Vautrot	2167	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 December 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-4,6-11,13-19,21-28 and 30* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-4,6-11,13-19,21-28 and 30* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *12 March 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *12/26/2006*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 26 December 2006 has been received and entered into the record. Since the IDS complies with the provisions of MPEP § 609, the references cited therein have been considered by the examiner. See attached forms PTO-1449.

Response to Amendment

2. The applicants' amendment, filed 26 December 2006, has been received, entered into the record and considered.

3. As a result of the amendment, claims 1, 2, 8, 10, 16 and 25 are amended. Claims 5, 12, 20 and 29 have been canceled. Claims 1 – 4, 6 – 11, 13 – 19, 21 – 28 and 30 are pending in the application.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 – 30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

6. The 101 rejections for claims 1, 3, 5, 6, and 9 are withdrawn in light of the amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1 – 3, 7, 8, 16 - 18, 22, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Cole** (US 2004/0196970) in view of **Kita et al.** (hereinafter **Kita**, US 6,430,611).

9. Regarding claims 1 and 16, **Cole** discloses a method of and machine readable medium having stored thereon executable program code which causes a machine to perform a method of collecting data from a storage server comprising:

scanning [searching] a directory on the storage server (See page 3, paragraph [0033] "In the above representative command line format, "pathname" identifies a target directory, the contents of which the user desires to be searched...");

determining a number of child nodes in the directory, and adding the number to a reference count (See page 4, paragraph [0035] "...it increments counters for the total

number of files and directories encountered, and then returns to the parent directory at 324.");

reducing the reference count after scanning the child node. (See page 4, paragraph [0035] "If, on the other hand, the user does wish for sub-directories to be recursively checked..., then the software proceeds at 336 to recursively test all files in each directory or sub-directory that is encountered." Examiner interprets the recursion routine to automatically decrement the count as described in the claim, since recursion would necessarily involve doing so. Also, while **Cole** is scanning for whether or not files are encrypted, the basic process of searching the directories for all of the files and collecting information, as noted in the claim, is still occurring.)

Cole does not explicitly disclose scanning a child node to collect information about the child node, and combining, concurrently to said scanning a child node, information collected by said scanning into a summary of the directory and storing the summary of the directory.

However, **Kita** discloses scanning a child node to collect information about the child node, and combining, concurrently to said scanning a child node, information collected by said scanning into a summary [Top N data] of the directory (See column 8, lines 8 – 11 "In step 420, the agent gathers information concerning ownership and statistics of the selected file, such as bytes of disk space occupied by the file." And see Kita column 8, lines 16 – 21 "Next, in step 422, the SRM agent updates per user file statistics for the owner of the selected file.... The process 400 continues with step 424 wherein Top N data for an appropriate directory or category is updated if necessary.

The Top N data for a category includes a listing of the top N files, users or some other parameter when sorted according to a descriptor such as largest, most recently accessed, oldest, etc...." This is showing concurrency in the scanning of the directory and the updating of the summary information as closely as concurrency can be shown. As each file is scanned, the information is updated. Therefore it is considered concurrent. Also, see Fig. 6 showing the scanning and updating occurring as it selects each file, also representing concurrency.); and

storing the summary of the directory. (See column 7, lines 47 – 50 "The information gathered in process 300 is then returned in step 332 to the SRM server where it is compiled, processed and stored in the SRM database.")

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of **Cole** with that of **Kita** because both references are related to processing directories located on a storage device and by including the concurrent scanning and combining as well as the storing as disclosed in **Kita**, the server can be more efficient by not being burdened with as much of the processing, while still remaining reliable current information. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include scanning a child node to collect information about the child node, and combining, concurrently to said scanning a child node, information collected by said scanning into a summary of the directory and storing the summary of the directory.

10. Regarding claims 2 and 17, **Cole** teaches a method and computer readable medium substantially as claimed. **Cole** does not explicitly teach wherein said storing the summary of the directory comprises writing the summary to a database server. However, **Kita** teaches wherein said storing the summary directory comprises writing [storing] the summary to a database server [SRM database]. (See column 5, lines 4 – 6 "The SRM server performs additional processing of the information received from the SRM agents and stores the information in the SRM database.") A person of ordinary skill in the at would have been motivated to combine the teachings of **Cole** with that of **Kita** because both references are related to processing directories located on a storage device and by including writing the summary to a database server as disclosed in **Kita**, the information that is gathered using the method as disclosed in **Cole** and be stored and used for further processing. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include wherein said storing the summary of the directory comprises writing the summary to the database server.

11. Regarding claims 3 and 18, **Cole** teaches a method and computer readable medium substantially as claimed. **Cole** does not explicitly teach scanning a child node comprises using an agent separate from the storage server to scan the child. However, **Kita** teaches scanning a child node comprises using an agent separate from the storage server to scan the child. (See column 4, line 67 – column 5, line 4 "The storage resource manager agents gather information from the computers on which they are installed, process the information, and in response to requests for the SRM server,

the SRM agents pass the processed information to the SRM server.") A person of ordinary skill in the at would have been motivated to combine the teachings of **Cole** with that of **Kita** because both references are related to processing directories located on a storage device and by including a separate agent as disclosed in **Kita**, the server can be more efficient by not being burdened with as much of the processing (see page 5, lines 27-29 "The information may be processed in the SRM agent to reduce the total quantity of information to be sent to the SRM server.") It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include scanning a child node comprises using an agent separate from the storage server to scan the child.

12. Regarding claims 7 and 22, **Cole** teaches a method and computer readable medium substantially as claimed. **Cole** does not explicitly teach accessing the summary using a graphical user interface (GUI). However, **Kita** teaches accessing the summary using a graphical user interface (GUI). (See column 5, lines 6-8 "The information stored in the SRM database is accessible to a user of the SRM system through the SRM user interface.") It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of **Cole** with that of **Kita** because both references are related to processing directories located on a storage device and by including a user interface as disclosed in **Kita**, the information is allowed to be accessed directly by the administrator. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include accessing the summary using a graphical user interface (GUI).

13. Regarding claims 8 and 23, **Cole** teaches a method and computer readable medium substantially as claimed. **Cole** does not explicitly teach accessing the summary using a GUI comprises accessing the summary over a network using a web browser. However, **Kita** teaches accessing the summary using a GUI comprises accessing the summary over a network using a web browser. (See column 6, lines 29 – 33 "...the SRM user interface consists of a workstation in the computer network having a web browser, such as Microsoft Internet Explorer Version 4.01, or higher, that allows the workstation to access the SRM server.") It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of **Cole** with that of **Kita** because both references are related to processing directories located on a storage device and by including a web browser for accessing the user interface as disclosed in **Kita**, the information is allowed to be accessed directly by the administrator anywhere internet accessible, providing for a more robust method. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include accessing the summary using a GUI comprises accessing the summary over a network using a web browser.

14. Regarding claims 9 and 24, **Cole** additionally discloses scanning another directory once the reference count is equal to zero. (See Cole, page 4, paragraph [0035] "If, on the other hand, the user does wish for sub-directories to be recursively checked..., then the software proceeds at 336 to recursively test all files in each directory or sub-directory that is encountered." Examiner also interprets the recursion

routine to incorporate this limitation from the claim. Once the count associated with the recursion routine reaches zero, the next directory is then scanned.)

15. Claims 4 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Cole** and **Kita** as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of **Mizelle et al.** (hereinafter, **Mizelle**, US 2004/0122936).

Cole and **Kita** teach a method and computer readable medium substantially as claimed.

Cole and **Kita** do not explicitly disclose writing the summary comprises writing the summary to a multi-appliance management application (MMA) before writing the summary to a database server.

However, **Mizelle** discloses writing the summary comprises writing the summary to a multi-appliance management application (MMA) [114] before writing the summary to a database server [124]. (See page 3, paragraph [0023] "The data management application114 stores and manages information that may suitably be stored on a data analysis storage server 124, which maintains a metric database 126 and a resource library 128.")

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in that art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Cole** and **Kita** with that of **Mizelle** because **Mizelle** also deals with processing data stored on servers across a network, and by including the MMA as disclosed in **Mizelle**, the method can be more efficient by only

transferring the summary to the server after the information has been processed by the application. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include writing the summary comprises writing the summary to a multi-appliance management application (MMA) before writing the summary to a database server.

16. Claims 6 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Cole** in view of **Kita** as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of **Leshem et al.** (hereinafter, **Leshem**, US 2005/0050203).

Cole and **Kita** teach a method and computer readable medium substantially as claimed.

Cole and **Kita** do not explicitly disclose scanning a directory comprises using a directory thread to scan the directory, and wherein scanning a child node comprises using a file thread to scan the child node.

However, **Leshem** discloses scanning a directory comprises using a directory thread [120] to scan the directory, and wherein scanning a child node comprises using a file thread [122] to scan the child node. (See page 11, paragraph [0159] "The use of multiple scanning threads provides the significant benefit of allowing multiple server requests to be pending simultaneous, which in-turn reduces the time required to complete the scanning process." While this is referring to scanning web pages, the rationale behind the threads are exactly the same as in the instant application. See paragraph [0161] "Upon initiation of the scanning process by the user, the main thread

120 obtains the URL (address) of the home page (or the URL of some other starting location) of the website to be scanned....[0162] "Once the home page URL has been obtained, the main thread 120 launches a scanning thread 122 to scan the HTML home page." Here, the directory thread represents the main thread, and the file thread is represented by the scanning thread.)

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Cole** and **Kita** with that of **Leshem** because they are in the area of data compilation across disparate storage systems, and websites located on various servers is analogous to storage devices located on various servers. By including the separate threads as disclosed in **Leshem**, the method, as quoted in the lines above, can be significantly more efficient by allowing simultaneous scans to occur. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include scanning a directory comprises using a directory thread to scan the directory, and wherein scanning a child node comprises using a file thread to scan the child node.

17. Claims 10, 11, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Hackworth** (US 2002/0125938) in view of **Kita**.

18. Regarding claim 10, **Hackworth** discloses an apparatus comprising:

a storage server having a mass storage device (See page 2, paragraph [0028] "In addition exemplary filers 110 and 112...are connected to the LAN. These filers...are networked storage appliances configured to control storage of, and access to, data in a

set of interconnected storage volumes 120 and 122, respectively...organized to include one or more RAID groups of physical storage disks for increased data storage integrity and reliability." Storage volumes 20 and 122 are examples of mass storage devices.);

an agent [monitor process] coupled to the storage server [management station], the agent to scan [polls] the mass storage device [volumes and devices] to collect information [statistical information] about a file stored on the storage server (See page 1, paragraph [0009] "A monitor process polls the volumes and devices for statistical information and returns it to the management station."); and

a database server coupled to the server and the agent to store the summary (See page 1, paragraph [0009] "There is a database that stores information about users in the group and various threshold values that are associated with the statistical information.")

Hackworth does not explicitly disclose to concurrently scan and combine information collected into a summary of a directory in which the file is located.

However, **Kita** discloses to concurrently scan and combine information collected into a summary [Top N data] of a directory in which the file is located. (See column 8, lines 8 – 11 "In step 420, the agent gathers information concerning ownership and statistics of the selected file, such as bytes of disk space occupied by the file." And see Kita column 8, lines 16 – 21 "Next, in step 422, the SRM agent updates per user file statistics for the owner of the selected file.... The process 400 continues with step 424 wherein Top N data for an appropriate directory or category is updated if necessary. The Top N data for a category includes a listing of the top N files, users or some other

parameter when sorted according to a descriptor such as largest, most recently accessed, oldest, etc...." This is showing concurrency in the scanning of the directory and the updating of the summary information as closely as concurrency can be shown. As each file is scanned, the information is updated. Therefore it is considered concurrent. Also, see Fig. 6 showing the scanning and updating occurring as it selects each file, also representing concurrency.)

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Hackworth** with that of **Kita** because both references are related to processing directories located on a storage device and by including the combined summary and collection as disclosed in **Kita**, the server can be more efficient by not being burdened with as much of the processing. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include to concurrently scan and combine information collected into a summary of a directory in which the file is located.

19. Regarding claim 11, **Hackworth** additionally discloses the storage server is a filer. (See page 1, paragraph [0002] "The network storage appliance or filer includes an operating system that implements a file system to logically organize the information as a hierarchical structure of directories and files on the disk.")

20. Regarding claim 15, **Hackworth** additionally discloses the agent has a first file system different from a second file system of the storage server. (See page 1,

paragraph [0002] "The network storage appliance or filer includes an operating system that implements a file system to logically organize the information as a hierarchical structure of directories and files on the disk." And see paragraph [0004] "Each volume is generally associated with its own file system..." The volume's own file system is part of the storage server from the claim.)

21. Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Hackworth** in view of **Kita** as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of **Mizelle**.

22. Regarding claim 13, **Hackworth** and **Kita** teach an apparatus substantially as claimed.

Hackworth and **Kita** fail to disclose a multi-appliance management application (MMA) coupled to the storage server and the agent, the MMA to manage the storage server.

However, **Mizelle** discloses a multi-appliance management application (MMA) coupled to the storage server and the agent, the MMA to manage the storage server. (See page 3, paragraph [0023] "The data management application 114 stores and manages information that may suitably be stored on a data analysis storage server 124, which maintains a metric database 126 and a resource library 128.")

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in that art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Hackworth** and **Kita** with that of **Mizelle** because

Mizelle also deals with processing data stored on servers across a network, and by including the MMA as disclosed in **Mizelle**, the method can be more efficient by only transferring the summary to the server after the information has been processed by the application. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include a multi-appliance management application (MMA) coupled to the storage server and the agent, the MMA to manage the storage server.

23. Regarding claim 14, **Hackworth** additionally discloses a graphical user interface (GUI) coupled to the MMA. (See page 3, paragraph [0029] "The information is displayed and manipulated using a graphical user interface (GUI) than can include a display, keyboard and mouse.")

24. Claims 25 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Cole** in view of **Kita** and in view of **Leshem.**

25. Regarding claim 25, **Cole** discloses a method of collecting data from a file server comprising:

scanning [searching] a directory on the file server (See page 3, paragraph [0033] "In the above representative command line format, "pathname" identifies a target directory, the contents of which the user desires to be searched...");

determining a number of child nodes in the directory and adding the number of child nodes to a reference count (See page 4, paragraph [0035] "...it increments

counters for the total number of files and directories encountered, and then returns to the parent directory at 324.");

reducing the count after scanning the child node. (See page 4, paragraph [0035] "If, on the other hand, the user does wish for sub-directories to be recursively checked..., then the software proceeds at 336 to recursively test all files in each directory or sub-directory that is encountered." Examiner interprets the recursion routine to automatically decrement the count as described in the claim, since recursion would necessarily involve doing so. Also, while **Cole** is scanning for whether or not files are encrypted, the basic process of searching the directories for all of the files and collecting information, as noted in the claim, is still occurring.)

Cole does not explicitly teach using a directory thread operated by an agent, a file thread operated by an agent, scanning a child node in the directory to determine information about the child node, concurrently to said scanning a child node, combining information determined by scanning into a summary of the file server and storing the summary on a database server.

However, **Leshem** discloses using a directory thread operated by an agent and using a file thread [122] operated by an agent. (See page 11, paragraph [0159] "The use of multiple scanning threads provides the significant benefit of allowing multiple server requests to be pending simultaneous, which in-turn reduces the time required to complete the scanning process." While this is referring to scanning web pages, the rationale behind the threads are exactly the same as in the instant application. See paragraph [0161] "Upon initiation of the scanning process by the user, the main thread

120 obtains the URL (address) of the home page (or the URL of some other starting location) of the website to be scanned....[0162] "Once the home page URL has been obtained, the main thread 120 launches a scanning thread 122 to scan the HTML home page." Here, the directory thread represents the main thread, and the file thread is represented by the scanning thread.) It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Cole** with that of **Leshem** because both are in the area of data compilation across disparate storage systems, and websites located on various servers is analogous to storage devices located on various servers. By including the separate threads as disclosed in **Leshem**, the method, as quoted in the lines above, can be significantly more efficient by allowing simultaneous scans to occur. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include using a directory thread operated by an agent and using a file thread [122] operated by an agent.

Additionally, **Kita** teaches scanning a child node in the directory to determine information about the child node (See column 8, lines 8 – 11 "In step 420, the agent gathers information concerning ownership and statistics of the selected file, such as bytes of disk space occupied by the file.");

concurrently to said scanning a child node, combining information determined by scanning into a summary of the file server (See Kita column 8, lines 16 – 21 "Next, in step 422, the SRM agent updates per user file statistics for the owner of the selected file.... The process 400 continues with step 424 wherein Top N data for an appropriate directory or category is updated if necessary. The Top N data for a category includes a

listing of the top N files, users or some other parameter when sorted according to a descriptor such as largest, most recently accessed, oldest, etc...." This is showing concurrency in the scanning of the directory and the updating of the summary information as closely as concurrency can be shown. As each file is scanned, the information is updated. Therefore it is considered concurrent. Also, see Fig. 6 showing the scanning and updating occurring as it selects each file, also representing concurrency.);

storing the summary on a database server [SRM database]. (See column 5, lines 4 – 6 "The SRM server performs additional processing of the information received from the SRM agents and stores the information in the SRM database.") A person of ordinary skill in the at would have been motivated to combine the teachings of **Cole** with that of **Kita** because both references are related to processing directories located on a storage device and by including writing the summary to a database server as disclosed in **Kita**, the information that is gathered using the method as disclosed in **Cole** and be stored and used for further processing. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include scanning a child node in the directory to determine information about the child node, concurrently to said scanning a child node, combining information determined by scanning into a summary of the file server and storing the summary on the database server.

26. Regarding claim 30, **Cole** additionally discloses scanning another directory once the reference count is equal to zero. (See Cole, page 4, paragraph [0035] "If, on the

other hand, the user does wish for sub-directories to be recursively checked..., then the software proceeds at 336 to recursively test all files in each directory or sub-directory that is encountered." Examiner also interprets the recursion routine to incorporate this limitation from the claim. Once the count associated with the recursion routine reaches zero, the next directory is then scanned.)

27. Claims 26, 27, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Cole** in view of **Kita** and in view of **Leshem** as applied to claim 25 above, and further in view of **Mizelle**.

28. Regarding claim 26, **Cole, Kita, and Leshem** teach a method substantially as claimed.

Cole, Kita, and Leshem fail to disclose the agent is controlled by a multi-appliance management application (MMA).

However, **Mizelle** discloses the agent is controlled by a multi-appliance management application (MMA). (See page 3, paragraph [0023] "The data management application 114 stores and manages information that may suitably be stored on a data analysis storage server 124, which maintains a metric database 126 and a resource library 128.")

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in that art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Cole, Kita, and Leshem** with that of **Mizelle** because **Mizelle** also deals with processing data stored on servers across a network,

and by including the MMA as disclosed in **Mizelle**, the method can be more efficient by only transferring the summary to the server after the information has been processed by the application using the MMA. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include the agent is controlled by a multi-appliance management application (MMA).

29. Regarding claim 27, **Kita** additionally discloses a graphical user interface (GUI) coupled to the MMA [SRM system]. (See column 5, lines 6-8 "The information stored in the SRM database is accessible to a user of the SRM system through the SRM user interface.")

30. Regarding claim 28, **Cole, Kita, and Leshem** teach a method substantially as claimed.

Cole, Kita, and Leshem fail to disclose the summary is written to the MMA before storing the summary on the database server.

However, **Mizelle** discloses the summary is written to the MMA [114] before storing the summary on the database server [124]. (See page 3, paragraph [0023] "The data management application114 stores and manages information that may suitably be stored on a data analysis storage server 124, which maintains a metric database 126 and a resource library 128.")

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in that art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Cole**, **Kita**, and **Leshem** with that of **Mizelle**

because **Mizelle** also deals with processing data stored on servers across a network, and by including the MMA as disclosed in **Mizelle**, the method can be more efficient by only transferring the summary to the server after the information has been processed by the application. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include the summary is written to the MMA before storing the summary on the database server.

Conclusion

31. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dennis L. Vautrot whose telephone number is 571-272-2184. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on 571-272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Dv
22 March 2007

CHONG H. KIM
PRIMARY EXAMINER